REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed September 16, 2009, claims 1 and 5 were rejected. Additionally, claims 2 – 4, 6, and 7 were objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully point out that claim 8 was not addressed in the Office action. Applicants respectfully request that the application be reconsidered in view of the below-provided remarks. No claims have been added or canceled.

For reference, claims 1 – 5 and 8 are amended to remove the reference numbers.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's review of the claims and determination that claims 2 – 4, 6, and 7 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office action states that claims 2 – 4, 6, and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have not rewritten the claims at this time in view of the below-provided remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baggett et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,215,371, hereinafter Baggett). Additionally, claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baggett. However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Baggett for the reasons provided below.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

"A method of extracting synchronization signals from an input video signal (Csync) comprising horizontal synchronization pulses at the start of video lines, for generating a horizontal synchronization signal (Hsync); said method comprising:
  a calculation step for calculating the duration (Δ) of the video lines in

said input video signal (Csync),

      a forcing step for forcing said input video signal (Csync) to an output level, said output level corresponding to the level of said input video signal (Csync) after the horizontal synchronization pulses, said input signal (Csync) being forced <u>between the end of each horizontal synchronization pulse and a moment defined by a first percentage (X1) of said line duration (Δ)</u>, for generating said horizontal synchronization signal (Hsync)." (emphasis added)

That is, claim 1 recites forcing the input video signal to an output level "between the end of each horizontal synchronization pulse and a moment defined by a first percentage (X1) of said line duration."

Applicant asserts that claim 1 is not anticipated by Baggett because Baggett does not disclose forcing the input video signal to an output level "between the end of each horizontal synchronization pulse and a moment defined by a first percentage (X1) of said line duration."

First, the Office action does not specifically address the above-identified limitation in the Office action. In support of the rejection of claim 1, the Office action states:

"Regarding claim 1, Baggett discloses a clamping circuit showing a calculation step (col. 4, lines 44 – 48, lines 58 – 60), and a forcing step (clamping switch 49). The clamped video signal in Baggett is effectively a horizontal synchronization signal (note col. 5, line 61, to col. 6, lines 4)."

As can be seen, the Office action does not specifically address how or where Baggett discloses forcing an input video signal to an output level "between the end of each horizontal synchronization pulse and a moment defined by a first percentage (X1) of said line duration" as recited in claim 1.

Second, Baggett discloses a technique for processing a video signal that involves clamping the video signal within the horizontal line synchronization pulse itself. In particular, Baggett discloses clamping the video signal during the "front porch" portion of the horizontal line synchronization pulse. With reference to Fig. 2, Baggett illustrates "an expanded view of one of the horizontal line synchronizing pulses 12" including the "front porch" (20). (Baggett col. 2, lines 22 – 26) Baggett goes on to disclose that the clamping occurs "during the front porch of the horizontal line synchronizing pulse." (Baggget col. 4, line 69 – col. 5, line 1). Clamping a video signal during the front porch

portion of the horizontal line synchronizing pulse does not disclose forcing an input video signal to an output level "between the end of each horizontal synchronization pulse and a moment defined by a first percentage (X1) of said line duration" as recited in claim 1.

Because Baggett does not disclose every limitation of claim 1, Applicants assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Baggett.

Independent Claim 5

Independent claim 5 includes similar limitations to claim 1. Although the language of claim 5 differs from the language of claim 1 and the scope of claim 5 should be interpreted independently of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that the remarks provided above in regard to claim 1 apply also to claim 5.

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 5. Applicants assert that dependent claim 8 is allowable at least based on allowable claim 5.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: December 7, 2009

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111